

HONORABLE JAMES L. ROBART

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
vs.  
  
MOTOROLA, INC., et al.,  
  
Defendants.  

---

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC, et al.,  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
vs.  
  
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. C10-1823-JLR

MICROSOFT'S 7/29/13  
MOTION TO SEAL

**NOTED FOR:**  
FRIDAY, AUGUST 9, 2013

**I. RELIEF REQUESTED**

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5(g) and paragraphs 2(a) and 8 of the protective order entered in this case, Microsoft respectfully seeks leave to file under seal the following documents:

- (1) Portions of Exhibits 2-4 and 6-11 to the Declaration of Christopher Wion in Support of Microsoft's Motions *in Limine* ("Wion Declaration");

MICROSOFT'S 7/29/13 MOTION TO SEAL - 1      No. C10-1823

LAW OFFICES  
**CALFO HARRIGAN LEYH & EAKES LLP**  
999 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 4400  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98104  
TEL., (206) 623-1700    FAX, (206) 623-8717

1 (2) Microsoft's Motions *in Limine* to the extent they refer to or rely on the above exhibits; and

2 (3) The Parties' Pretrial Order being filed contemporaneously herewith.

3  
4 Microsoft seeks to file the foregoing materials under seal because they have been  
5 marked as "Confidential" by Motorola and/or Microsoft under the terms of the protective order  
6 issued in this case. To the extent these documents disclose the parties' negotiating history (the  
7 subject of Microsoft's third motion *in limine*), the parties agree that said documents should  
8 remain under seal. In fact, the Court has previously found that those negotiations could be  
9 sealed. *See* 11/12/12 Order on Motions to Seal (Dkt. No. 567), at 5 ("Accordingly, the court  
10 concludes that the importance of encouraging frank settlement negotiations outweighs the  
11 public's interest in knowing what was discussed in those settlement negotiations").

12 Microsoft also moves to seal limited portions of the Pretrial Order that disclose costs  
13 and expenses Microsoft incurred in connection with relocation of its distribution facility from  
14 Germany to The Netherlands, and the amount of attorneys' fees incurred in connection with  
15 defending itself against Motorola's suits for injunctive relief.

16 Microsoft takes no position with respect to the other materials Motorola has requested  
17 be sealed, or with respect to those paragraphs of the Pretrial Order that Motorola has requested  
18 be sealed.

19 For these reasons, Microsoft respectfully requests permission to file the above-  
20 referenced documents under seal and that the Court direct such documents to remain under  
21 seal. Microsoft is publicly filing redacted versions of the Pretrial Order, its Motions *in Limine*,  
22 and Exhibits 6-7 of the Wion Declaration.

## 23 **II. LCR 5(g)(3)(A) CERTIFICATION**

24 The parties met and conferred on July 29, 2013 in an effort to minimize the amount of  
25 material to be filed under seal in connection with this motion. As a result, the parties were able

1 to reduce both the number of documents to be redacted (or sealed in their entirety) as well as  
2 the scope of the proposed redactions.

### 3 **III. FACTS & AUTHORITY**

#### 4 **A. The Operative Protective Order and Applicable Court Rules Both Permit and** 5 **Require Microsoft to File Confidential Information under Seal.**

6 Pursuant to the Protective Order issued by the Court on July 21, 2011, as amended by  
7 orders dated October 3, 2012 and July 25, 2013, Microsoft is permitted to file materials  
8 designated by either party as Confidential Business Information<sup>1</sup> under seal, with such  
9 documents to remain under seal upon Court approval. Paragraphs 2(a) and 8 of the Protective  
10 Order govern the filing of documents under seal. Paragraph 2(a) provides:

11 Any information submitted in pre-trial discovery or in a pleading, motion, or  
12 response to a motion in this action, either voluntarily or pursuant to order, and  
13 which is asserted by a supplier to contain or constitute Confidential Business  
14 Information shall be so designated by such supplier in writing...and shall be  
15 segregated from other information being submitted. Documents shall be clearly  
16 and prominently marked on their face with the legend: “[SUPPLIER’S NAME]  
17 CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION, SUBJECT TO  
PROTECTIVE ORDER” or a comparable notice. During the pre-trial phase of  
this action, such information, whether submitted in writing or in oral testimony,  
shall be disclosed only *in camera* before the Court and shall be filed only under  
seal, pursuant to Rule 5(g) of the Local Civil Rules of the United States District  
Court for the Western District of Washington.

18 Paragraph 8 likewise provides that:

19 Any Confidential Business Information submitted to the Court in connection  
20 with a motion or other proceeding within the purview of this action shall be  
submitted under seal pursuant to paragraph 2 above.

21 *Id.*, at ¶ 8.

22 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recognize that courts may permit parties to file

---

23  
24 <sup>1</sup> “Confidential Business Information” is defined in the parties’ Protective Order as “information which has not  
25 been made public and which concerns or relates to the trade secrets, processes, operations, style of work, or  
apparatus, or to the production, sales, shipments, purchases, transfers, identification of customers, inventories,  
amounts or source of any income, profits, losses, or expenditures.” Protective Order Regarding the Disclosure  
and Use of Discovery Materials (ECF No. 72), ¶1 (amended by Order dated October 3, 2012 (ECF No. 447)).

1 “trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial information” under  
 2 seal. Rule 26(c)(1)(G) and (H). District courts “are in the best position to weigh the fairly  
 3 competing needs and interests of the parties affected by discovery,” in crafting the appropriate  
 4 treatment of documents for which protected treatment is requested. *Seattle Times Co. v.*  
 5 *Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20, 36, 104 S. Ct. 2199 (1984); *see also Phillips v. General Motors Corp.*,  
 6 307 F.3d 1206, 1211-1212 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002).

7 A party seeking to seal a judicial record attached to a dispositive motion must articulate  
 8 “compelling reasons” that outweigh the public policies favoring disclosure. *Kamakana v. City*  
 9 *and Cnty. Of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). This presumption may be  
 10 overcome only on a compelling showing that the public’s right of access is outweighed by the  
 11 interests of the public and the parties in protecting the court’s files from public review.  
 12 However, “the public interest in understanding the judicial system would appear to be less  
 13 where ... the documents in question are irrelevant to the Court’s decision.” *Network*  
 14 *Appliance, Inc. v. Sun Microsystems Inc.*, 2010 WL 841274, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2010)  
 15 (citing *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179) (documents supporting dispositive motion “[not] bearing  
 16 on the resolution of the dispute on the merits ... are therefore more akin to the ‘unrelated,’ non-  
 17 dispositive motion documents the Ninth Circuit contemplated in *Kamakana*”).

18 “In general, ‘compelling reasons’ . . . exist when such ‘court files might have become a  
 19 vehicle for improper purposes,’ such as the use of records to . . . release trade secrets.”  
 20 *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179 (citing *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598  
 21 (1978)). The Ninth Circuit has adopted the Restatement’s definition of “trade secret.” *See*  
 22 *Ultimate Timing, L.L.C. v. Simms*, 2010 WL 786021, at \*1-2 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 4, 2010)  
 23 (citing *Clark v. Bunker*, 453 F.2d 1006, 1009 (9th Cir. 1972)). Under that standard, a “trade  
 24 secret may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used  
 25

1 in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors  
2 who do not know or use it." *Id.*, 2010 WL 786021, at \*2 (quotations omitted).

3 **B. Good Cause Exists to Grant Microsoft's Motion.**

4 1. Microsoft seeks to seal portions of Exhibits 2-4 and 6-11 at Motorola's Request.

5 Motorola has requested that Microsoft file portions of Exhibits 2-4 and 6-11 under seal  
6 because they disclose Motorola's confidential business information. Pursuant to the terms of  
7 the protective order, Microsoft has filed these documents under seal. Microsoft takes no  
8 position with respect to the confidentiality of these documents.

9 2. The Parties' Licensing Negotiations Should Remain Sealed.

10 Microsoft's third motion *in limine* relates to the parties' negotiating history. The Court  
11 has already ruled that compelling reasons exist to maintain the confidentiality of the parties'  
12 negotiating history. *See* 11/12/12 Order on Motions to Seal (Dkt. No. 567), at 5  
13 ("Accordingly, the court concludes that the importance of encouraging frank settlement  
14 negotiations outweighs the public's interest in knowing what was discussed in those settlement  
15 negotiations"). The Court has also previously sealed the Parties Nondisclosure Agreement  
16 (Dkt. No. 484). For these reasons, Microsoft respectfully requests that the Court grant its  
17 motion with respect to those sealed materials cited in Microsoft's third motion *in limine*.

18 3. Portions of the Joint Pretrial Order Should Remain Sealed.

19 Microsoft redacted portions of the Pretrial Order that disclose the parties' negotiating  
20 history (paragraphs 3.C. 2-17), as well as two paragraphs that disclose the increased operating  
21 costs Microsoft was forced to incur as a result of having to relocate from Germany to The  
22 Netherlands and the fees Microsoft has been forced to pay to defend against Motorola's  
23 injunction actions (3.B.11 – 12).  
24  
25

1 The parties' negotiating history should be sealed for the reasons set forth above. The  
 2 financial figures should be sealed because they are not generally known or publicly available,  
 3 and the companies involved treat them as confidential for the reasons set forth in Microsoft's  
 4 previous motions to seal (*see, e.g.*, 7/17/13 Response to Motion to Seal (Dkt. No. 765).

5 Microsoft takes no position with respect to those separate portions of the Pretrial Order  
 6 Motorola has requested be redacted.

#### 7 **IV. CONCLUSION**

8 For the reasons set forth herein, Microsoft respectfully requests that the Court grant its  
 9 motion. A [Proposed] Order Granting Microsoft's 7/29/13 Motion to Seal has been submitted  
 10 herewith.<sup>2</sup>

11 DATED this 29th day of July, 2013.

12  
 13 **RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,**  
 14 **CALFO HARRIGAN LEYH & EAKES LLP**

15 By s/Athur W. Harrigan, Jr.  
 16 Arthur W. Harrigan, Jr., WSBA #1751

17 By s/Christopher Wion  
 18 Christopher Wion, WSBA #33207

19 By s/Shane P. Cramer  
 20 Shane P. Cramer, WSBA #35099  
 21 999 Third Avenue, Suite 4400  
 22 Seattle, WA 98104  
 23 Phone: 206-623-1700  
 24 arthurh@calfoharrigan.com  
 25 chrisw@calfoharrigan.com  
 shanec@calfoharrigan.com

---

<sup>2</sup> Nothing herein is intended as a waiver of Microsoft's right to contest Motorola's designation of material as Confidential Business Information in accordance with the terms of the Protective Order. Microsoft expressly reserves the right to do so as the circumstances warrant.

By s/T. Andrew Culbert  
T. Andrew Culbert

By s/David E. Killough  
David E. Killough

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
1 Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052  
Phone: 425-882-8080  
Fax: 425-869-1327

David T. Pritikin  
Richard A. Cederoth  
Constantine L. Trela, Jr.  
William H. Baumgartner, Jr.  
Ellen S. Robbins  
Douglas I. Lewis  
David C. Giardina  
John W. McBride  
Nathaniel C. Love

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
One South Dearborn  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Phone: 312-853-7000  
Fax: 312-853-7036

Carter G. Phillips  
Brian R. Nester

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
1501 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: 202-736-8000  
Fax: 202-736-8711

Counsel for Microsoft Corp.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Florine Fujita, swear under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington to the following:

1. I am over the age of 21 and not a party to this action.
2. On this 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2013, I caused the preceding document to be served on counsel of record in the following manner:

**Attorneys for Motorola Solutions, Inc., and Motorola Mobility, Inc.:**

Ralph Palumbo, WSBA #04751  
Philip S. McCune, WSBA #21081  
Summit Law Group  
315 Fifth Ave. South, Suite 1000  
Seattle, WA 98104-2682  
Telephone: 206-676-7000  
Email: [Summit1823@summitlaw.com](mailto:Summit1823@summitlaw.com)

\_\_\_\_\_ Messenger  
\_\_\_\_\_ US Mail  
\_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile  
  X   ECF

Steven Pepe (*pro hac vice*)  
Jesse J. Jenner (*pro hac vice*)  
Ropes & Gray LLP  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036-8704  
Telephone: (212) 596-9046  
Email: [steven.pepe@ropesgray.com](mailto:steven.pepe@ropesgray.com)  
Email: [jesse.jenner@ropesgray.com](mailto:jesse.jenner@ropesgray.com)

\_\_\_\_\_ Messenger  
\_\_\_\_\_ US Mail  
\_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile  
  X   ECF

Norman H. Beamer (*pro hac vice*)  
Ropes & Gray LLP  
1900 University Avenue, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2284  
Telephone: (650) 617-4030  
Email: [norman.beamer@ropesgray.com](mailto:norman.beamer@ropesgray.com)

\_\_\_\_\_ Messenger  
\_\_\_\_\_ US Mail  
\_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile  
  X   ECF



Paul M. Schoenhard (*pro hac vice*)

Ropes & Gray LLP

One Metro Center

700 12<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Suite 900

Washington, DC 20005-3948

Telephone: (202) 508-4693

Email: [Paul.schoenhard@ropesgray.com](mailto:Paul.schoenhard@ropesgray.com)

\_\_\_\_\_ Messenger

\_\_\_\_\_ US Mail

\_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile

  X   ECF

Andrea Pallios Roberts (*pro hac vice*)

Brian C. Cannon (*pro hac vice*)

Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: (650) 801-5000

Email: [andreaproberts@quinnemanuel.com](mailto:andreaproberts@quinnemanuel.com)

Email: [briancannon@quinnemanuel.com](mailto:briancannon@quinnemanuel.com)

\_\_\_\_\_ Messenger

\_\_\_\_\_ US Mail

\_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile

  X   ECF

Kathleen M. Sullivan (*pro hac vice*)

David Elihu (*pro hac vice*)

Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

51 Madison Ave., 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor

New York, NY 10010

Telephone: (212) 849-7000

Email: [kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com](mailto:kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com)

\_\_\_\_\_ Messenger

\_\_\_\_\_ US Mail

\_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile

  X   ECF

William Price (*pro hac vice*)

Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP

865 S. Figuera St., 10<sup>th</sup> Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90017

Telephone: (212) 443-3000

Email: [williamprice@quinnemanuel.com](mailto:williamprice@quinnemanuel.com)

[MicrosoftvMotoBreachofRANDCase@quinnemanuel.com](mailto:MicrosoftvMotoBreachofRANDCase@quinnemanuel.com)

\_\_\_\_\_ Messenger

\_\_\_\_\_ US Mail

\_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile

  X   ECF

DATED this 29th day of July, 2013.

/s/ Florine Fujita

FLORINE FUJITA